

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

A DRIVING TIONANG	EH INC DATE	CIDCT MAAGED DIVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNET DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/889,023 01/10/2002		Toshihiro Morita	450101-02844 4611		
22850 . 75	90 12/11/2006		EXAMINER		
C. IRVIN MCCLELLAND			CHEN, TE Y		
OBLON, SPIVA	AK, MCCLELLAND, N				
1940 DUKE STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			2161	_	

DATE MAILED: 12/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		09/889,02	23	MORITA ET AL.	
		Examiner		Art Unit	:
		Susan Y. (Chen	2161	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the	cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	ldress
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RECHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pere to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by steply received by the Office later than three months after the med patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THE R 1.136(a). In no event n. eriod will apply and wi tatute, cause the appl	IIS COMMUNICATION, however, may a reply be II expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro ication to become ABANDON	DN. timely filed m the mailing date of this c IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status					
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>2</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) Since this application is in condition for alloclosed in accordance with the practice und	This action is nowance except	on-final. for formal matters, p		e merits is
Dienociti	on of Claims				
4)⊠ 5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ Applicati 9)□ 10)□	Claim(s) 41-43 and 48-68 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 41-43 and 48-68 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and on Papers The specification is objected to by the Example The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the control of the oath or declaration is objected to by the	nd/or election reminer. accepted or b) the drawing(s) b	equirement. objected to by the e held in abeyance. Seed if the drawing(s) is constant.	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 Cl	• •
•	•	e Examiner. No	ne the attached Offic	e Action of form F	0-132.
12) <u></u> a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International But see the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been nents have been priority docume reau (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Applica nts have been recei e 17.2(a)).	ition No ved in this National	Stage
2) Notic 3) Inform	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	·)	4) Interview Summal Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date	

Response to Amendment

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 25, 2006 has been entered.

Claim Status

Claims 41-43, 48-68 are pending for examination, claims 41, 48, 53, 55, 60, 62, 67-68 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 41-43 and 48-68, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,412,012 issued to Bieganski et al. (hereinafter

Art Unit: 2161

referred as '012 Bieganski) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,959,288 issued to Medina et al. (hereinafter referred as '288 Medina).

Claims 41, 48, 53, 55, 60, 62 and 67-68:

Bieganski discloses an information processing system as claimed [e.g., Fig. 1] comprising:

- data recorded in the recording usage history data and the related data recorded in the recording means based on at least two filtering data set [e.g., the CPU (102, Fig. 1) can coupled to the memory system (104, Fig. 1) and the secondary storage(108 of Fig. 1) to log history data indicative of usage history of the group of contents. Furthermore, the data being stored in the History Set (203, Fig. 2) and the customer's behavior data recorded at a shopping set as specified at col. 8, lines 7-8, and the Purchased Items associated to a particular user's Transaction, and the item compatibility rule data sets at (900, Fig. 9), and the recommendation sets generated by the engine (600, Fig. 14; col. 14, lines 31-33)];
- a computing unit configured to compute a weight related to a
 number of checkout per each of the contents based on both the
 history data and one of the at least two filtering data set [e.g., the
 compatibility modifier (200, Fig. 2) can accept a stored number of

Art Unit: 2161

checkout (or the number of times each item was purchased, Fig. 9) per each of the contents from the history data on a filtering rule specified by a marketer or customer or the processing of recommendation engine itself (col. 9, lines 63-49) to compute a weight related to the number of checkout (the steps 752-756, Fig. 7A)], the computing unit receiving input from a user to edit the at least two filtering data sets [e.g., col. 6, lines 43-46, Fig.(s) 3-5 and associated texts];

- a selecting unit for selecting a content from a group of contents based on weight computed by the computing means [e.g., the user interface adapter coupled to the Input Device (114, 118, Fig 1) can be used to select the modified recommendation set based on weight computed by the compatibility modifier (Fig. 5; Fig. 6; col. 13, line 21 col. 14, line 14; col. 14, line 31-col. 15, line 2)];
- a displaying unit for display a list of at least titles in the information related to the contents selected by the selecting means [e.g., the Display Adapter (112, Fig. 1) coupled to the Display Device (116, Fig. 1) can display a list of recommended books selected by the book reviewer (col. 7, lines 49-54)].

'012 Bieganski did not directly explain that the selection unit configured to create at least two filtering packages based on the at least two filtering data sets, wherein each of the at least two filtering packages includes information identifying the content

Application Control (Val

Art Unit: 2161

selected, and the information identify the content is capable of being shared by at least two filtering packages so as to allow the content to belong to both the at least two filtering package at any given time.

However, '288 Medina discloses the claimed features [e.g., col. 11, lines 7-30, col. 68, lines 13-67, the content processing tool of Fig.(s) 8, 12-13 and associated texts]

'012 Bieganski and '288 Medina are in the same endeavor to facilitate the sharing of group of content data via open network user interface, therefore, with the teachings of Bieganski and Medina in front of him/her, it would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bieganski's system with the technique taught by Medina to provide the selection unit as claimed that is configured to create at least two filtering packages based on the at least two filtering data sets, wherein each of the at least two filtering packages includes information identifying the content selected, and the information identify the content is capable of being shared by at least two filtering packages so as to allow the content to belong to both the at least two filtering package at any given time. Because by doing so, as suggested by Medina the combined system will provides a standard for creating digital players on end-user device that facilitates an end user to distribute, share and manage of a local library of digital contents no other than what was purchased [e.g., col. 5, lines 39-53, Fig.(s) 8, 12-13 and associated texts].

As to claims 42, 49, 51-52, 54, 56, 58-59, 61, 63, and 65-66:

Art Unit: 2161

Except all the features recited in claims 41, 48, 53, 55, 60, and 62, the combined system of Bieganski and Medina further discloses that the system comprising means to computes per each of the contents as weight for a period for which the content has been checked out or for the genre of the content or for playing time of the content [e.g., '288 Medina: col. 13, lines 1-9; col. 93, line15].

As to claims 43, 50, 57 and 64:

Except all the features recited in claims 41, 48, 53, 55, 60, and 62, the combined system of Bieganski and Medina further discloses that the system comprising means for adding new filtering data [e.g., '288 Medina: col. 11, lines 19-22].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments based on newly amended features with respect to claims 41-43 and 48-68 filed on September 25, 2006 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as discussed above. Furthermore, In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., multiple filtering packages are titled "Ten Best Pops" and "Ten Best Rock and Rolls" respectively and the songs in one of these packages share the same song ID) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Morita et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,804,666) which discloses an information processor to process on-line digital content shopping packages via program storage medium.

Points of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Y. Chen whose telephone number is 571-272-4016. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2161

Page 8

Examiner
Art Unit 2161 Susan Chan

December 8, 2006